

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE AND DISASTER MANAGEMENT

(G. O. Ms. No. 43, dated 20th October 2010)

NOTIFICATION

The Government of Puducherry having been satisfied that the land specified in the Schedule below has to be acquired for a public purpose *viz.*, for the assignment of free house sites to landless labourers in Yanam region and it having already been decided that the entire amount of compensation to be awarded for the land is to be paid from the public revenue, the following declaration is issued under section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Central Act 1 of 1894).

DECLARATION

Under section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Central Act 1 of 1894), the Lieutenant-Governor of Puducherry, hereby declares that the land specified in the Schedule below and measuring H.00-A.51-Ca.95 be the same a little more or less, is needed for public purpose *viz.*, for the assignment of free house sites to landless labourers in Yanam region and under sections 3 and 7 of the said Act, the Deputy Collector (Revenue), Yanam is appointed to perform the functions of the Collector under the said Act and decided to take order for the acquisition of the said land. The plan of the land is kept in the Office of the Deputy Collector (Revenue), Yanam and it may be inspected at any time during the office hours.

SCHEDULE

Name of the Sub-Taluk : Yanam

Name of the Revenue Village : Kanakalapeta.

Sl. No.	Survey No.	Classification	Name of the land-owners/ interested persons	Extent under acquisition		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		
				H.	A.	Ca.
1	C/4/2	R.M.	1. M/s. Kundenya Udyog, Auto Ancillaries Private Limited, Yanam. 2. The Manager, M/s. Pondicherry Industrial Promotion Development and Investment Corporation Limited, Puducherry.	0	51	95
Total				0	51	95

(By order of the Lieutenant-Governor)

G. RAGESH CHANDRA,
Special Secretary-cum-District Collector.

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 207/AIL/Lab./J/2010, dated 15th October 2010)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, the Award in I. D. No. 10/2003, dated 8-9-2010 of the Labour Court, Puducherry in respect of the industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Hindustan Lever Limited (Detergent Division) and its workmen Thiru T. Boopathi and Tmt. Poorani over non-employment has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) read with the notification issued in Labour Department's G. O. Ms. No. 20/91/Lab./L, dated 23-5-1991, it is hereby directed by Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said Award shall be published in the official gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

G. MALAR KANNAN,
Joint Secretary to Government (Labour).

BEFORE THE LABOUR COURT AT PONDICHERRY

Present : Thiru T. Mohandass, M.A., B.L., P.G.D.H.R.D.I.
 II Additional District Judge,
 Presiding Officer, Labour Court,
 Pondicherry.

Wednesday, the 8th day of September 2010

I.D. No. 10/2003.

1. T. Boopathy ,
 2. Poorani,
 both are residing at No. 16, Main Road,
 Bharathi Nagar, Ariyur Post,
 Pondicherry. .. Petitioners.

Versus

1. The General Manager,
 Hindustan Lever Limited,
 Detergent Division, Vadamangalam,
 Pondicherry.
 2. M/s. Sun Flower,
 No. 3, 5th Cross, S.M.V. Puram,
 Villianur, Pondicherry. .. Respondents.

This industrial dispute coming on 30-8-2010 for final hearing before me in the presence of Thiru G. Mohan Keerthi Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner, Thiruvalargal L. Sathish and S. Doraissamy, Advocates for the first respondent, second respondent called absent and set *ex parte*, upon hearing both sides, upon perusing the case records, after having stood over for consideration till this day, this court passed the following:

AWARD

This industrial dispute arises out of the reference made by the Labour Department, Government of Pondicherry *vide* G.O. Rt. No.82/Lab./AIL/2003/J dated 30-6-2003 for adjudicating the following :—

(a) Whether the claim of the petitioners Thiruvalargal Boopathi and Poorani that they are the workmen of M/s. Hindustan Lever Limited is justified or not?

(b) If so, whether the non-employment of the petitioners are justified or not? If not, to what relief, they are entitled to?

(c) To compute the relief, if any, awarded in terms of money, if it can be so computed?

2. The petitioners, in their claim statement, have averred as follows:

The petitioners were joined in the first respondent management in the month of April 1995 as Gardeners and were in continuous service till 31st March 2002. These petitioners were receiving orders, directions and instruction from the General Manager (Factory) and his assistants.

On 1-4-2002, they were stopped at the gate and refused employment without assigning any reason. They reported at the factory everyday at 8.30 a.m. but they were refused employment by the management. On 1-5-2002 the petitioners have sent letters addressed to the management, requesting for reemployment in service, but no action was taken by the respondent management. The petitioners, after waiting for a long time, had addressed a letter, dated 3-6-2002 and 1-7-2002 to the Conciliation Officer, Labour Department, Pondicherry reporting about their non-employment.

In the conciliation, the first respondent management submitted a letter, dated 6-9-2002, stating that the petitioners were contract workers under the second respondent and that the second respondent had deployed the petitioners to work in another factory and hence the dispute has to be resolved with the second respondent and that the first respondent is not answerable to the claim. The petitioners have submitted letters, dated 20-3-2003 disputing the stand taken by the management and requesting the Conciliation Officer to consider their dispute. Finally the conciliation ended in failure and the same was reported by the Conciliation Officer through his Failure Report, dated 6-5-2003. Based on the said Failure Report, the Government of Pondicherry has notified the Failure Report and has referred the dispute under section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

The petitioners are the employees under the first respondent management, which fact is borne by EPF record and ESI record. The first respondent management, instead of regularising the voucher paid employees, has denied employment to the petitioners, which is in violation of the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act and amounts to victimisation of the workmen for no fault of them. The stand taken by the management that the petitioners are contract workers under the second respondent is one invented by the first respondent in order to camouflage their illegal activity of offering non-employment to the petitioners. Hence, this industrial dispute is filed to pass an order declaring that the non-employment of these petitioners is unjustified, illegal and for a direction to reinstate both of them in service with back wages, continuity of service and other benefits that have accrued.

3. The second respondent called absent and set *ex parte*. In the counter statement, the first respondent has stated as follows:-

This respondent's establishment is engaged in the manufacture of detergents. It is a factory registered under the Factories Act. As it engages more than 20 workmen as "Contract Labour" it has registered

itself as a Principal Employer under the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act. The Certificate of Registration, dated 17-12-1997 enumerates the names of various contractors including the second respondent as the Gardening Contractor. The maintenance of garden and the landscape of the factory is entrusted to the second respondent and they are also acting as a Gardening Contractor for various other establishments in and around Pondicherry. These petitioners were engaged by M/s. Sun Flower.

The second respondent used to deploy their men to various establishments with whom they have entered into a contract for maintenance of garden. It appears that in April/May 2002, the second respondent directed the petitioners to work in another factory with whom it had a contract for maintenance for garden and the petitioners refused to go and work there. This respondent made enquires with M/s. Sun Flower from which it is gathered that the second respondent have not terminated the services of the petitioners and they continue to be on the rolls of second respondent. As per the information gathered from the second respondent, the petitioners were transferred to M/s. Ram Tech, Pondicherry, where they have worked only for half-a-day and then they refused to go there.

Further, the definition of the term "employee" in section 2(e) of EPF and Misc. Provisions Act and Section 2(9) of ESI Act covers even persons employed through a contractor and the primary liability to pay contribution in respect of contract employees, rests only with the principal employer. It was for this reason, these petitioners were covered under the ESI Act and EPF and Misc. Provisions Act and contributions were remitted to the code number of this respondent. As the petitioners were not in the employment of the first respondent, the first respondent is not answerable to their claim. Hence, they pray for dismissal of the industrial dispute.

4. On the side of the petitioners, the first petitioner examined himself as PW1 and marked Ex.P1 to Ex.P12 were marked. On the side of the first respondent, one Vijay Kumar was examined as RW1 and through him, Ex.R1 to Ex.RQ were marked.

5. The points for determination are:

(1). Whether the petitioners are the workmen under the first respondent?

(2). Whether the petitioners can be considered for reinstatement in service with back wages?

6. On point No.1:

This Industrial Dispute is filed by the petitioners for their reinstatement in service. The contention of the petitioners is that they were the employees under the first respondent and instead of regularising the voucher paid employees, the first respondent has denied employment to them, which is in violation of provision of Industrial Disputes Act and amounts to victimisation of the workmen for no fault of them. Further contention of the petitioners is that they were contract workers under the second respondent is one invented by the management in order to camouflage their illegal activity of offering non-employment to them.

7. *Per contra*, the contention of the first respondent is that the maintenance of garden and the landscape of the factory is entrusted to the second respondent and they were acting as a Gardening Contractor for various other establishments in and around Pondicherry and the petitioners were engaged by the second respondent and hence they are not answerable to the claim of the petitioners. Reliance was placed in the following judgment rendered by the Hon'ble High Court, Madras:

2009 (2) L.L.N. 281:

"Appointment - Contract labour or appointment under principal employer - Determination of question - First respondent's case is that he was engaged by the petitioner Corporation from 1st August 1998 and his work was supervised by second respondent, a contractor - After about 8 months, first respondent's services were terminated - He claimed salary for the period from the petitioner Corporation and raised industrial dispute - Labour Court, because of non-production of documents like attendance register by the petitioner-Corporation, took a decision that the first respondent was employee of the petitioner-Corporation and awarded reinstatement with attendant benefits - This award is challenged in this writ petition by the Corporation - Held, there can be occasions when the State or its instrumentalities employ persons temporarily or on daily wage in a contingency as additional hands - But this does not confer any right on such persons to get regular employment - Further the first respondent was employed by the second respondent contractor and there was no employer-management between the first respondent and the petitioner-Corporation - Order of Labour Court *set aside* - Writ petition by petitioner-Corporation allowed."

8. To prove the contention of the petitioners, Ex.P1 to Ex.P12 were marked on their side Ex.P1 and Ex.P2 are letters sent by the first petitioner to the first respondent, requesting to give employment to him. Ex.P3 and Ex.P4 are the letters sent by the first

respondent to the Conciliation Officer intimating that the petitioners are not their employees. Ex.P5 and Ex.P6 are the copy of the letters sent by the first and second petitioners to the Conciliation Officer intimating about their non-employment by the first respondent. Ex.P7 is the copy of the Failure Report sent by the Conciliation Officer to the Secretary to Government (Labour), Pondicherry. Ex.P8 is the copy of the notification of the Labour Department. On perusal of the above documents, it is seen that though the petitioners have claimed that they were the employees under the first respondent, no appointment order or any other document relating to their appointment by the first respondent is not filed. In Ex.P3 the first respondent has clearly stated that the second respondent is one of the contractors and the second respondent used to deploy their own man which included the petitioners. It is further stated in Ex.P3 that the second respondent maintains the muster roll and payment of wages register. To prove the said fact, the copies of muster roll of the workers employed with the second respondent for the period June 1996 to March 2002 was marked as Ex.R3 and copies of register of wages of the workers employed with the second respondent for the said period was marked as Ex.R4. On perusal of the said records, it is evident that the both the petitioners were getting monthly salary from the second respondent. Apart from that the first petitioner, who was examined as PW1 in his cross-examination has clearly admitted that he has not filed any document to show that he was employee under the first respondent. He further admitted in his cross-examination that during the year 1996 all the garden works were given under contract basis and the second respondent was the contractor to maintain the garden works.

9. Further on the side of the first respondent copy of the Purchase order was marked as Ex.R5 series. Perusal of Ex.R5 would reveal that the first respondent has placed order with the second respondent for making rockery garden and planting neem trees near workers toilet block. Hence, the documents marked under Ex.P1 to Ex.P12 on the side of the petitioner, are not in any way helpful to their claim. On the other hand, the documents filed under Ex.R3 to Ex.R5 on the side of the first respondent would support their claim that the second respondent was their contractor, who appointed the petitioners as their workers.

10. The further contention of the petitioners is that they were the employees under the first respondent, which fact is borne by the EPF record and ESI record. In order to prove their contention, the petitioners have marked the copy of the Identity Card of the petitioners issued by the ESI Corporation and the copy of the EPF slips were marked as Ex.P9 to Ex.P12.

11. But the learned counsel for the first respondent would contend that the definition of the term "employee" in section 2(e) of the EPF and Misc. Provisions Act and section 2(9) of the ESI Act covers even persons employed through a contractor and the primary liability to pay contribution in respect of contract employees, rests only with the principal employer and hence the petitioners were covered under the ESI Act and EPF and Misc. Provisions Act and the contributions were remitted under the code number of the first respondent and in this regard, the first respondent has filed copy of the returns of contributions filed by the second respondent for the period from 1-10-2001 to 31-3-2002 as Ex.P8 and Copies of Form 10 C and Form 19 submitted by the first respondent to EPFO, requesting settlement of EPF amount to the petitioners. On perusal of Ex.P8, it is seen that the contribution, in respect of their employees including the petitioners herein, was paid by the second respondent and submitted the same to the Employees State Insurance Corporation under the code of first respondent. Hence, the available records would clearly prove that the second respondent is the contractor under the first respondent and according to section 2(3) of EPF and Misc. Provisions Act and Section 2(9) of ESI Act, the contribution in respect of the petitioners rests with the first respondent as principal employer. As the contribution of EPF and ESI in respect of the petitioners was paid under the code number of the first respondent, the petitioners cannot be treated as employees under the first respondent. Hence, the contention of the petitioners in this aspect cannot be taken into consideration.

12. When the employer and employee relationship is denied by the first respondent, it is the duty of the petitioners to prove the said fact. In *Swapan Das Gupta and Others Vs. First Labour Court of West Bengal* in 1976 L. I.C.202. it is held as follows:-

"Where a person asserts that he was a workman of the company and it is denied by the company, it is for him to prove the fact. It is not for the company to prove that he was not an employee of the company but of some other person."

In the case on hand, as already stated, the petitioners have failed to prove the employer employee relationship between them and the first respondent and though on their side, Ex.P1 to Ex.P12 were marked, the said documents have not supported to their case. Apart from that, in order to prove their status, the second respondent has not appeared before this court and they were called absent and set *ex parte*. Under these circumstances, this court has come to the conclusion that the petitioners were not the employees under the first respondent and they were the employees under the

second respondent only and hence, the first respondent is not responsible for the non-employment of the petitioners. Accordingly, this point is answered.

On issue No.2:

13. The contention of the petitioners is that they were the employees under the first respondent and on 1-4-2002 they were stopped at the gate and refused employment without assigning any reason.

14. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the first respondent would submit that the petitioners were the employees under the second respondent and they used to deploy their men to various establishments with whom, they have entered into a contract for maintenance of garden. He further added that the second respondent directed the petitioners to work in another factory with whom, it had a contract for maintenance for garden and the petitioners refused to go and work there and the first respondent made enquires with the second respondent, from which it is gathered that the second respondent have not terminated the services of the petitioners and they continue to be on the rolls of second respondent and then the petitioners were transferred to M/s. Ram Tech., Pondicherry, where they have worked only for half-a-day and then they refused to go there. The learned counsel for the first respondent would further contend that before the Conciliation Officer, a request was made to send notice to the contractor but unfortunately no formal notice was given to the second respondent, though their representative participated in the Joint conciliation meeting and they have signed in the conciliation proceedings.

15. In order to disprove the contention of the first respondent, as already stated the second respondent has not appeared before this court to give evidence and he was called absent and set *ex parte*. Hence, this court comes to the conclusion that the petitioners are the employees under the second respondent and the second respondent is directed to reinstate the petitioners in service. It will be appropriate to pass an order that the petitioners are entitled to claim 30% of the back wages and other benefits from April 2002 in the circumstances of the case. Accordingly, this point is answered.

16. In the result, the industrial dispute is partly allowed without costs as against the second respondent and the award is passed to the effect that the non-employment of the petitioners and their dismissal from service are unjustified and are illegal and therefore it is hereby *set aside*. The second respondent shall reinstate the petitioners immediately. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioners are

entitled to claim 30% of back wages with continuity of service and other benefits. The industrial dispute as against the first respondent is dismissed.

Typed to my dictation, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this the 8th day of September 2010.

T. MOHANDASS,
II Additional District Judge,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Pondicherry.

List of witnesses examined for the petitioner :

PW 1 — 17-04-2008 - Boopathy

List of witnesses examined for the respondent:

RW 1 — 10-11-2009 - M. Vijay Kumar

List of exhibits marked for the petitioner:

- Ex.P 1 — Copy of the letter, dated 1-5-2002 sent by the first petitioner to the first respondent.
- Ex.P 2 — Copy of the letter, dated 3-6-2002 sent by the first petitioner to the first respondent.
- Ex.P 3 — Copy of the letter, dated 6-9-2002 sent by the first respondent to the Labour Officer.
- Ex.P 4 — Copy of the letter, dated 6-9-2002 sent by the first respondent to the Labour Officer.
- Ex.P 5 — Copy of the letter, dated 20-3-2003 sent by the first petitioner to the Conciliation Officer.
- Ex.P 6 — Copy of the letter, dated 20-3-2003 by the second petitioner to the Conciliation Officer.
- Ex.P 7 — Failure report, dated 6-5-2003.
- Ex.P 8 — Notification, dated 30-6-2003.
- Ex.P 9 — Photocopy of the ESI, Identity card of the 1st petitioner, dated 1-6-1996.
- Ex.P10 — Photocopy of the ESI, Identity Card of the 2nd petitioner, dated 1-6-1996.
- Ex.P11 — Photocopy of the EPF slip of the 1st petitioner.
- Ex.P12 — Photocopy of the EPF slip of the second petitioner.

List of exhibits marked for the respondent:

- Ex.R1 — Authorisation letter, dated 8-7-2009.
- Ex.R2 — Copy of the Certificate of Registration, dated 17-12-1997.

- Ex.R3 — Copies of the muster roll of the workers.
- Ex.R4 — Copies of the register of wages of the workers.
- Ex.R5 — Copies of the purchase order placed by the first respondent.
- Ex.R6 — Copies of bank challans towards deposit of EPF contribution for April 2000 to July 2002.
- Ex.R7 — Copies of bank challans for March to July 2002.
- Ex.R 8 — Copy of returns of contributions filed by second respondent from 1-10-2001 to 31-3-2002.
- Ex.R9 — Copies of Form 10 C and Form 19, dated 20-5-2002.

T. MOHANDASS,
 II Additional District Judge,
 Presiding Officer,
 Labour Court, Pondicherry.

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G O. Rt. No. 208/AIL/Lab./J/2010, dated 15th October 2010)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, the Award in I. D. No. 35/2003, dated 19-4-2010 of the Labour Court, Puducherry in respect of the industrial dispute raised by Gyan Leather National Workers Union against the management of M/s. Gyan Leather Board Limited over closure has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) read with the notification issued in Labour Department's G. O. Ms. No. 20/91/Lab/L, dated 23-5-1991, it is hereby directed by Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said Award shall be published in the official gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

G. MALAR KANNAN,
 Joint Secretary to Government (Labour).

BEFORE THE LABOUR COURT AT PONDICHERRY

Present : Thiru E.M.K.S. SIDDHARTHAR, M.A., B.L.,
 II Additional District Judge,
 Presiding Officer, Labour Court,
 Pondicherry.

Monday, the 19th day of April 2010

I.D. No. 35/2003

The President,
 Gyan Leather National Workers Union,
 Pondicherry. .. Petitioner.

Versus

M/s. Gyan Leather Board Limited,
 Thutipet Village, Pondicherry. .. Respondent.

This industrial dispute coming on this day for hearing before me in the presence of Thiru R. Mugundhan, counsel for the petitioner and Thiru S. Rathinasabapathy, counsel for the respondent, upon perusing the case records, this court passed the following:

AWARD

This industrial dispute arises out of the reference made by the Labour Department, Government of Pondicherry *vide* G. O. Rt. No.158/Lab./AIL/J/2003, dated 12-12-2003 for adjudication of the following industrial dispute :

(a) Whether the closure of M/s. Gyan Leather Board Limited, Pondicherry is justified or not ?

(b) To what reliefs/benefits the aggrieved workmen are entitled to?

(c) To compute the relief if any, awarded in terms of money, if it can be so computed?

2. On the side of the petitioner, the claim statement was filed on 15-2-2007 and posted for filing of the counter on 20-1-2007. Then the matter was posted for filing of the counter to 6-10-2007, 29-11-2007, 16-2-2008, 13-3-2008, 24-4-2008, 18-6-2008, 7-8-2008, 23-9-2008, 23-10-2008, 10-12-2008, 6-1-2009, 29-1-2009, 5-3-2009, 2-4-2009, 4-6-2009, 2-7-2009, 13-8-2009, 17-9-2009, 12-11-2009, 26-11-2009, 3-12-2009, 10-12-2009 and 17-12-2009. But for the past 2 ½ (two and half) years in 23 (twenty-three) hearings, there was no representation from the respondent side. This petition has been filed in the year 2003. For the past seven years, this case is pending before this court without any progress. Hence, the matter was posted to 17-12-2009 for filing the chief proof affidavit of the petitioner. The petitioner filed his chief proof affidavit and he was examined

as PW1 and marked Ex.P1 to Ex.P3. Satisfied. Claim proved. Hence, the industrial dispute is allowed and the closure of the respondent company by name M/s. Gyan Leather Board Limited, Pondicherry is unjustified and illegal and hence, the respondent is hereby directed to pay to the workers salary and other benefits due from July 2002. However, there is no order as to costs.

Typed to my dictation, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this the 19th day of April, 2010.

E.M.K.S. SIDDHARTHAR,
II Additional District Judge,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Pondicherry.

List of witnesses marked for the petitioner :

PW1— 8-4-2010—Paramasivam

List of exhibits marked for the petitioner :

Ex.P1— Copy of the letter sent by the petitioner, dated 23-8-2002.

Ex.P2— Photocopy of the closure notice, dated 30-10-2002.

Ex.P3— Conciliation failure report, dated 6-6-2003.

E.M.K.S. SIDDHARTHAR,
II Additional District Judge,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Pondicherry.

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
**DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL AND
ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS (PERSONNEL WING)**
No. A-34012/1/2010-DP&AR (Exam),

Puducherry, the 8th October 2010.

NOTIFICATION

Tmt. Meera, S., Stenographer, Grade-III, Office of the Deputy Director (Administration), Directorate of Agriculture, Puducherry is declared to have passed the Accountancy Test in Commercial Taxes Department held on 4-9-2010.

GIDDI MRUTHYUNJAYA DURGA RAO,
Under Secretary to Government.

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY **CONFIDENTIAL AND CABINET DEPARTMENT CHIEF VIGILANCE OFFICE**

(G.O.Ms.No. 2, dated 11th October 2010)

NOTIFICATION

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of the section 3 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (Central Act 49 of 1988) read with notification issued under S.O. No 125 (E), dated 14th February 1989 of the Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, New Delhi, the Lieutenant-Governor, Puducherry on the recommendations of the High Court, Madras, is pleased to appoint Tmt. R. Margaret Rosaline, Additional District and Sessions Judge, Puducherry at Karaikal as Special Judge for Karaikal region, for the purpose of the said Act and for the said purpose hereby makes the following amendment to the notification issued under G.O.Ms.1, dated 24th July 2001 of the Confidential and Cabinet Department (Chief Vigilance Office), Puducherry and published in the Part-1 of Extraordinary Gazette No. 106, dated 26th July 2001 namely:—

AMENDMENT

In the Table to the said notification, for the existing entries under column (2) against serial number 2, the following shall be substituted namely:—

“Tmt. R. Margaret Rosaline, Additional District and Sessions Judge, Puducherry at Karaikal”

(By order of the Lieutenant-Governor)

G. THEVA NEETHI DHAS,
Special Secretary to Government.

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER
No. 650/CEO/S1/Exam/2010-11.

Puducherry, the 11th October 2010.

NOTIFICATION

It is hereby notified that the original Matric Mark Certificate, bearing Serial Number A 032525 under Register Number 207934 of April 1991 in respect of K. Srinivasan, an ex-pupil of Petit Seminaire Higher Secondary School, Puducherry, is reported to have been lost and beyond scope of recovery and it is proposed to issue a duplicate certificate. If the original certificate is to be found by anybody, it should be sent to the Director of Government Examinations, Chennai-6, for cancellation, as it is no longer valid.

T. ANOUMANDANE,
Chief Educational Officer.